DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 946 EC 132 423

TITLE Issues of Common Concern: A Report of the HCEEP Minority Leadership Workshop.

INSTITUTION North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill. Technical Assistance Development System.; Washington Univ., Seattle. Western States Technical Assistance Resource.

SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE May 79

CONTRACT 300-77-0508

NOTE 68p.; Minority Leadership Workshop (Arlington, VA, May 21-23, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Early Childhood Education; Federal Programs; Minority Groups; *Minority Group Teachers; *Program Development; Workshops

IDENTIFIERS *Handicapped Childrens Early Education Program

ABSTRACT

The document summarizes discussions and presentations of a 1979 workshop to examine minority leadership aspects of the federally funded Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP). The following 11 titles and presenters are included: "Insights into the Leadership Role" (J. Birckhead); "Managing the Development of an Educational Model" (D. Rostetter, et al.); "Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills" (B. Richardson, T. Wiley); "Program Planning and Review Procedures/Record Keeping" (H. Hankerson); "Fiscal Management" (L. Fitts, T. Black); "Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills" (P. Chinn); "Liaison with Other Agencies" (S. Furuno); "BEH and Early Childhood Education" (M. Semmes); "Early Education of the Handicapped: The Ecology of the Professional Field" (E. Jackson); "Federal Legislation and Funding Sources" (J. DeWeerd, et al.); and "Synthesis of Issues" (M. Gaasholt). Information on workshop evaluation is followed by six appendixes, including a list of recommendations generated by the participants. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199946

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

May 21–23, 1979

Issues of common concern

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. HARRISON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A report of the HCEEP Minority Leadership Workshop sponsored by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, the Western States Technical Assistance Resource, the Technical Assistance Development System, and the Robert R. Moton Memorial Institute

EC 132 423

Produced by
Western States Technical Assistance Resource
(WESTAR), Seattle, Washington
Technical Assistance Development System
(TADS), Chapel Hill, North Carolina

2

OCT 20 1980

Produced under contract number 300-77-0508 from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

Printed in the United States of America.

University of Washington, 1979

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iv
FOREWORD, David Rostetter		v
SECTION 1	INTRODUCTION TO THE MINORITY LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP	1
SECTION 2	PRESENTATIONS AND SMALL GROUP SESSIONS	13
	Insights into the Leadership Role Jane Birckhead	13
	Managing the Development of an Educational Model Dave Rostetter, Bud Moore, Pat Trohanis	14
	Small Group Discussion Sessions	16
	Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills Barbara Richardson, Torcey Wiley	18
	Program Planning and Review Procedures/ Record Keeping Henry Hankerson	19
	Fiscal Management Leonard Fitts, Tal Black	21
	Discussion of Issues	21
	Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills Philip Chinn	22
	Liaison with Other Agencies Setsu Furuno	23
	BEH and Early Childhood Education Marilyn Semmes	23
	Early Education of the Handicapped: The Ecology of the Professional Field Elouise Jackson	23
	Federal Legislation and Funding Sources Jane DeWeerd, Barbara Smith, Rosa Trapp-Dukes, Pat Trohanis	24
	Synthesis of Issues Marie Gaasholt	25
SECTION 3	WORKSHOP EVALUATION	27
APPENDICES		
A	Agenda and Participants' List	40
B	Minority Workshop Interest Survey	46
C	Summary of Participant-Identified Issues	48
D	Recommendations Generated by Participants	53
E	Minority Task Force Position Paper	56
F	Minority Workshop Evaluation Form	59

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Numerous persons were responsibie for the planning and coordination of the Minority Leadership Workshop held on May 21, 22 and 23, 1979, at the Sheraton National Hotel in Arlington, Virginia. David Rostetter and Ed Wilson were resource persons from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH), Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP).

The two technical assistance agencies, TADS (Technical Assistance Development System) and WESTAR (Western States Technical Assistance Resource) worked closely together to organize the workshop. Tal Black, Elouise Jackson, and Pat Trohanis represented TADS, and Marie Gaasholt and Bud Moore represented WESTAR. Bertram A. Coppock, Jr. and Sandra Gales-Young from the Robert R. Moton Memorial Institute provided additional assistance.

This document is the result of combined efforts of TADS and WESTAR staff. Appreciation is extended to the Minority Leadership Consortium Steering Committee and BEH staff for their review of the draft and helpful suggestions.

FOREWORD

"Issues of Common Concern" is a step toward clarifying and acting upon the challenging task of developing service delivery models which can meet the educational needs of a pluralistic society. It is imperative that the educational needs of young handicapped children be established as a major priority for the educational system. These children are in desperate need of appropriate early intervention and typically respond to that intervention with remarkable gains in growth and development. Within the context of a great need for stimulation of services to young handicapped children are those groups which are traditionally bypassed in terms of the social, economic, and political advantages and opportunities available to other segments of American society.

The Hispanic, Black, Native American, and Asian American populations have been systematically excluded from full participation in the American educational experience. Children in these cultural groups suffer the greatest risk when handicapped early in their development. Hopefully this proceedings document will contribute to increased access of bypassed groups to one federal program serving handicapped children and their families.

The Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP), administered by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH), began working specifically in this area when a group of minority professionals met with BEH staff in 1976. The group pointed out that, despite its good record of serving minority children in 130 demonstration projects, HCEEP had not been able to increase or maximize the involvement of minority professionals in that program. A number of activities were undertaken by HCEEP to improve this situation. The first strategy focused on increasing the number and level of involvement of minority professionals in HCEEP. Increased utilization of minorities as field readers and presenters at workshops and conferences were the first steps. Increased technical assistance and stimulation of grant applications from minority organizations were other strategies supported with funds and personnel.

This document, resulting from the Minority Leadership Workshop in May 1979, is a direct and significant result of these activities. Its significance is based on the fact that the minority professionals in HCEEP have coalesced to assume a major leadership position. That leadership focuses not only on the increased involvement of minority professionals, but more importantly on how and where the leadership resource can be utilized to improve services to children, families, and the field of education. Thus, by providing the support for leadership to develop and emerge, HCEEP

is now able to fully benefit from the expertise and talent of a culturally diverse group of professionals committed to the improved and increased delivery of services to young handicapped children from all groups within society. The increased involvement, advocacy, and resources which are available through this effort will help all of us to accomplish our goal of serving all handicapped children.

DAVID ROSTETTER

Division of Innovation and Development
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
October 1979

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE MINORITY LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP

The Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP) is a network of projects funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) of the U.S. Office of Education for the purpose of developing and disseminating various models of early intervention for young handicapped children. The underlying intention behind the establishment of model programs is to develop exemplary techniques for various populations which will increase the effectiveness of intervention procedures with young handicapped children.

To assist HCEEP projects in reaching model demonstration status and fulfilling individual project objectives, BEH has contracted the services of two technical assistance agencies, TADS (Technical Assistance Development System) and WESTAR (Western States Technical Assistance Resource). Technical assistance (TA) is provided to HCEEP projects in a number of ways. The most common form is to assist projects at their own sites in planning and implementing various components of their program and enhancing staff development. Another form of technical assistance is to organize workshops which address common areas of concern. The positive aspects of the workshop format are that it encourages information sharing among projects, continued support to each other, and transfer of new practices and products beyond the workshop. The purpose of this document is to describe and examine the outcomes of a recent workshop organized for minority leaders of HCEEP projects.

RATIONALE FOR THE MINORITY LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP

Several years ago, minority project directors voiced a concern about the scarce representation of minorities within the HCEEP network and the large number of those who did not compete successfully for continuation funding. In an effort to examine these concerns and generate recommendations for future planning, BEH developed the Minority Leadership Workshop. At BEH request, the two TA agencies (TADS and WESTAR) and the Robert R. Moton Memorial Institute (a Washington, D.C.-based agency funded to stimulate HCEEP proposals from minority populations) organized and sponsored the workshop. Through the

combined efforts of these agencies, the Minority Leadership Workshop was held on May 21-23, 1979, at the Sheraton National Hotel in Arlington, Virginia. (See Appendix A for workshop agenda and participants' list.) This workshop represented the most significant gathering of HCEEP minority leaders to address their unique concerns. Some of the more fundamental issues of the workshop revolved around the dearth of minority-led projects, the need to increase minority participation in the HCEEP network, and the development of strategies and methodologies related to effective programming for minority children and their families. Information exchange--sharing, giving, and receiving--could have been the overall workshop theme. This was evident in Dave Rostetter's (BEH Project Officer) opening remarks that it was just as important for BEH to obtain feedback from the participants as it was for the participants to obtain additional knowledge. He suggested that participants continually ask themselves how to maximize the strengths of minority projects and combine them with the strengths of BEH, TADS, WESTAR, and Moton to promote the effectiveness of their programs.

This general attitude is reflected in the specific purposes for the workshop:

1. To promote the development of leadership skills in directing an HCEEP project and in contributing to the HCEEP network.
2. To provide an opportunity for workshop participants to share resources developed by their respective projects.
3. To identify issues of common concern to minority personnel within HCEEP and to develop a series of recommendations to address these concerns.
4. To encourage participation of minority professionals in the future development of early childhood education for the handicapped, especially within the HCEEP network.

It was agreed that the Minority Leadership Workshop should provide a climate whereby a free exchange of ideas, information and problems unique to minority-led projects could be explored by participants and planners. The purposes most definitely helped the planners in making content area selections, but perhaps even more importantly, they influenced the decisions regarding the organizational structure of the workshop.

ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING PLANNING DECISIONS

As much as possible, the planners attempted to draw upon emerging concepts within theories of adult learning when making their decisions about the workshop. Although the planners did not consciously identify a set of assumptions regarding the most appropriate way to arrange the workshop, it was apparent that an implicit set of premises about learning and learning environments was in operation throughout the planning stages. These assumptions included:

1. Participants should be actively involved in planning, conducting, and following-up the workshop.
2. Participants are more motivated and involved when the content is problem-oriented rather than theoretically oriented. The participants will be motivated to apply what they have learned at the workshop. Therefore, the participant enters the learning setting with a problem-solving orientation.
3. A climate of openness and respect is helpful in identifying what the participants want and need to learn.
4. Participants respond positively to the opportunity to work from their strengths. People are more effective when they view themselves as contributors to a problem's solution.
5. Facts and information provided by outside presenters should be related to the participants' needs. This information will facilitate the participants' application of the knowledge to actual program sites.
6. Participants tend to feel committed to a decision or activity in direct proportion to their participation in or influence on the planning and decision-making process.
7. Participants seem better able to apply new skills, refine their skills, and continue growing as they get feedback and support from others.
8. The participants' experience counts for as much as any formal body of knowledge. Both are exchangeable and equally supporting.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE ASSUMPTIONS

As indicated earlier, the implications of these assumptions were numerous and affected both the content and organization of the workshop. The most obvious consequences are described below.

TOPICAL INTEREST SURVEY

If the content areas were to reflect what the participants wanted to learn, then it became apparent that an in-depth interest survey among the participants was necessary. In order to accomplish this, each participant was contacted via telephone approximately two months before the workshop. During this first conversation, the participants were given a brief description of the general scope of the workshop and offered an invitation to attend. Thereafter they were notified that a Topical Interest Survey Form (Appendix B) would be mailed to them. They were asked to complete the form and identify additional areas of concern which they wanted addressed at the workshop. A second telephone call was primarily devoted to gathering the interest survey data and encouraging additional topics, as well as suggestions for presenters and workshop organization. At all times, an attempt was made to solicit ideas and involve participants in the planning activities.

After the two TA agencies had summarized the data from the interest survey and made tentative decisions as to the topics which would satisfy the greatest number of participants, a third telephone call was made. At that time, the participants indicated which small group sessions they wanted to attend. This conversation provided another opportunity to discuss new issues of concern which may have been identified since the second call. The participants were very open about their desires and demonstrated a willingness to share some of the most current problems they were experiencing in their respective projects. These issues and/or problems were organized under the following areas:

1. Parent involvement: motivating and using parents more effectively, especially in light of cultural differences.
2. Language and cultural barriers: especially in terms of recruitment and assessment.
3. Cooperative relationships and feedback: among individual projects, BEH, and the TA agencies.
4. Impact of racism on minorities in relationship to delivery of services: parental involvement, appropriate assessment techniques, etc.
5. Financial management: practical tactics, strategies, continuation funding, etc.
6. Interagency coordination: establishing contacts, service coordination, etc.
7. Cultural sensitivity: developing sensitivity between dominant and minority group cultures.

The interest survey process was most productive. Many new and timely ideas were brought to the surface which otherwise may have remained dormant. Also, a greater feeling of rapport between the participants and the TA contact person was established. Several participants expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to share in the planning phase and indicated that this involvement had increased their interest and motivation in attending the workshop.

PROBLEM-ORIENTED APPROACH

A genuine "problem-oriented" educational approach assumes that the learner will participate in the identification of the problem as well as the choice of the procedures by which the problem will be approached. It also implies that the participants will engage in problem-solving activities. The necessary means toward problem-solving is to have a learning situation which includes both assimilative and accomodative processes (based upon Piaget's [1950] developmental theory and Gagne's [1965] eight types of learning). A more balanced mode of assimilation/accommodation learning will occur in an educational situation that takes its orientation around a problem. However, problem-solving is dependent upon the degree to which the basic issues which are causing the problems are identified and examined. It was essential that the participants continually attempt to identify common elements generic to all minority-led projects. By focusing their attention on the structural rather than internal dimensions of the problems, it also was possible for the minority leaders to identify and examine some common concerns generic to all HCEEP projects as well as those unique to minority populations.

Problem-oriented pedagogy must be supplemented with participant steering. These two principles, problem-orientation and participant steering, imply and depend upon each other's existence. Furthermore, the identification of goals is an essential element within a problem-oriented pedagogy simply because goals are the inverse of a problem and because they exist and will affect group progress regardless of the degree of specification. Carkhuff (1973) has succinctly made this discrimination: "The definition of the problem leads directly to the goal (p. 37)."

The implications of the problem-oriented approach will affect the content, process and outcomes of the learning activity. In fact, as an educational approach, it will

theoretically remove many of the traditional idiosyncrasies of conventional education and replace them with learner influence, an open curriculum, and a new role for the teacher (or in the case of our workshop, the planners and presenters). Through the interest survey it was possible to identify some of the more crucial areas of interest and relevancy and subsequently organize the content around these areas. But the problem-oriented approach also had implications for the presenters. Within this framework the presenter was viewed as a learning reference for the participants rather than a traditional instructor. Hence, the workshop planners believed that, in order for the identified issues to be addressed more directly and from an experimental point of view, the presenters should represent diverse ethnic/cultural backgrounds as well as serve as content persons. The presenters were therefore encouraged to "tell it like it is" and "stress the approach to the problem" rather than to dictate solutions to the participants. Ideally, a dialogue should exist between presenters and participants.

Time constraints often make it difficult to incorporate problem-orientation into a workshop format. However, every possible attempt was made to facilitate problem-solving activities during the Minority Leadership Workshop. For example, after the major presentations, the participants were organized in small groups for the purpose of discussing the information just presented. The participants were asked to relate this information to their own experiences and then provide feedback to the large group regarding the relevancy of the information from the presentations.

USING SMALL AND LARGE GROUPS

Small groups increase the opportunities for an open dialogue, identification of relevant content, active involvement, self-examination, sharing of ideas, and a feeling of comradeship. However, small groups are not always efficient. Depending upon the objective, another learning format (such as large group presentations and/or written material) may be a more appropriate choice. However, each format can be misused. For example, a large group can foster a feeling of non-involvement, and small groups can easily go astray by not keeping on task. Thus, it is necessary to keep the objective in mind and then select the format which most likely will achieve the desired result and benefit the participants. Frequently, a combination of large and small groups is advisable. This was demonstrated at the Minority Leadership Workshop: the

large group sessions allowed the participants to receive a large body of facts and information from experts, and the small groups allowed the participants to absorb and respond to that information and relate it to their own needs.

Small group discussions were another example of how the planners made a conscious attempt to encourage an open dialogue among participants and between participants and presenters. At the same time they gave the participants, presenters and planners an opportunity for self-examination and active involvement. The participants were quick to draw upon the immediate resources within the small group and rely upon their own experiences.

FLEXIBILITY

A problem-oriented approach also demands that a certain degree of flexibility be available for program changes. As the adage says, "The best laid plans of mice and men oft go astray." Such was the case with this workshop. On the first morning some of the participants suggested an alteration in the agenda which would provide more time for discussion of problem areas. Originally this activity was scheduled for the afternoon of the second day. However, some participants objected to this arrangement: (1) they felt it important to identify these issues earlier in the course of the workshop; (2) they voiced some concern that too little time was allotted for this activity; and (3) they wanted to organize their future recommendations around the issues of common concern, which they felt would be difficult under the original workshop schedule. Therefore, it was decided to shift the discussion of common concerns to the first day of the workshop. This alteration proved especially effective. Several participants indicated that this rather simple act was interpreted as proof that the planners respected their needs and wishes.

PARTICIPANT EXPERIENCE

It should be apparent that the focus of the workshop was on the participants' identified needs and interests. It was assumed that facts and information would be used not for the purpose of accumulation, but for the purpose of problem solving. In this process, the participants' experience is equal in importance to the information given by an authority. Both are exchangeable.

Since participant experience and expertise are valuable but often hidden or overlooked resources, it is necessary to structure the learning situation in ways which will increase

the probability that the participants will share their information. One way to do this is to ask the participants to serve in leadership roles. This strategy was adopted in several ways. First, some participants were asked to serve as resource persons for the small group sessions. A resource person was considered as someone with experience and background knowledge in the topical area being addressed in the small group session. Resource persons accepted this responsibility before the workshop. Second, participants served as group facilitators. Facilitators opened the small group session, made necessary introductions, established a discussion format, and generally saw that the session kept moving. They were also responsible for making any feedback presentations to the large group and checking with the recorder to be sure that major points of the session had been accurately described. The overall intention was to provide an accepting and supportive climate, with heavy reliance on participant responsibility and involvement.

BALANCING PROCESS AND CONTENT

Principles and strategies associated with process and content models of learning were combined to meet the purposes of the Minority Leadership Workshop. The following descriptions of content and process models are based on the theoretical work of Knowles (1977) and the application of these models in western European countries (Illeris, 1974).

Content models are employed by most traditional educators and have influenced attitudes about how the learning situation should be organized. The content model begins with the teacher (or presenter, planner, curriculum designer, etc.) deciding in advance the knowledge or skill to be learned, arranging this body of content into logical units, selecting the most efficient means for transmitting this content (lectures, readings, laboratory experiments, films, tapes, etc.), and then developing a plan for presenting these content units in some sort of sequence.

In contrast to content models, the process model is concerned with the procedures for involving learners in the process of learning. The teacher (facilitator, consultant, planner, etc.) will be concerned with such elements as: (1) establishing a climate conducive to learning; (2) creating a means for mutual planning; (3) assessing the needs for learning; (4) determining the expectations and capabilities of the learners; (5) formulating program objectives (content) that will meet the learner's needs, expectations

and capabilities; (6) conducting these learning experiences with suitable techniques and materials; and (7) evaluating the learning outcomes and reassessing learning needs.

The difference between these models is quite subtle. It is important to note that both models are concerned with content. But the content model emphasizes transmitting information and skills, whereas the process model is concerned with procedures and resources for helping learners acquire information and skills.

While planning for the Minority Leadership Workshop, it became obvious that a dual content/process approach would be desirable. Through the interest survey, the participants had identified specific content areas which called for concrete information. Thus, it was necessary for presenters with expertise to address these particular concerns. This type of activity reflects the content model. At the same time, the participants indicated that they wanted time to share problems, interests and concerns with one another in order to identify some common issues relevant to their particular situations. The process model was more appropriate for these activities.

One way of determining the effectiveness of both models is to keep an ongoing record of the type and number of topics attended to in the small group sessions. Ideally, the process model should facilitate the identification of new topics, while the content model should stimulate a discussion of the preplanned topics. A summary of the topics discussed in the small group sessions is provided in Appendix C. A daily breakdown of the topics indicates that each model was effective. On the first day of the workshop, 79 discussion topics were recorded. Approximately one-third of the topics were related to the presentations. The remaining issues focused more directly upon new problem areas and specific issues of minority projects. During the second day, fewer topics (49) were discussed, and generally these reflected the content areas covered in the large and small group presentations.

The final day of the workshop was devoted to making recommendations to BEH, TA agencies, and the minority leaders (see Appendix D). These recommendations reflect the many problems and issues of concern identified by the minority leaders participating in the Minority Leadership Workshop. They also provide the participants, BEH, and the TA agencies with guidelines for future planning. Moreover, the list of recommendations is solid evidence that the assumptions and strategies of process and content

models of education are compatible and conducive to productive and creative thinking.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

Far too often, conferences and workshops are short-term learning experiences. Usually a great deal of information is offered, but there is little opportunity to determine to what degree the information is transferred and/or applied to other situations. Follow-up activities are one method of assessing the appropriateness and durability of the content and outcomes of a learning situation.

Several follow-up activities were planned for the participants of the Minority Leadership Workshop. In fact, the participants suggested the majority of follow-up activities, including a minority leadership task force. The task force was organized with the purpose of formalizing a consortium of minority leaders from BEH-funded HCEEP projects. (See Appendix E for the task force position paper.) This consortium will address the problems unique to minorities while developing and implementing a communication network among minority leaders. While the consortium is perceived by the participants as a long-range project, it is a direct result of the Minority Leadership Workshop.

In addition to the minority task force, there was a conscious effort on the part of BEH and the TA agencies to solicit feedback from the participants, especially regarding the list of recommendations generated at the workshop. Likewise, the participants received written materials pertaining to minority issues and follow-up letters concerning the workshop. Perhaps the major commitment to follow-up was the decision by BEH to organize another Minority Leadership Workshop during the 1979-80 fiscal year.

It is reasonable to expect some reduction in positive feelings after a workshop. The initial enthusiasm of working on a set of common problems with colleagues is not likely to remain over time. Therefore, it is important to plan realistic follow-up activities which will enhance continued learning and the application of new ideas and plans. Telephone calls, progress reports and contact referrals are some of the most obvious strategies. It is hoped the repertoire of meaningful and effective follow-up activities will be improved as we become more familiar with this important part of a workshop.

SUMMARY REMARKS

The foregoing discussion described the purpose, rationale, and implications of the assumptions surrounding the planning and conducting of the 1979 Minority Leadership Workshop. At the onset it was clear that there was, and continues to be, a need to identify and examine the unique problems encountered by minority leaders within the HCEEP network. The problems identified at the workshop revolved around two general areas: (a) ethos of the minority leadership role and skills, and (b) the provision of services to minority children and families. By drawing upon the combined resources of the minority leaders, it was possible to take the first step toward developing more network participation by minority leaders and a concept of a culturally responsive education for young handicapped children and their families.

The nature of the workshop influenced the decisions regarding the selection of content areas as well as strategies to deal with them. It was assumed that the starting point for learning must be connected to and oriented around issues and concerns related to specific problems. Furthermore, the participants were included in the selection of the issues as well as the subsequent decisions regarding approaches toward understanding, illuminating, and/or solving the problem.

Thus, the workshop rested to a large degree on the hope that the participants would be willing to share their reservoir of experience. But in order to tap this resource, it was imperative that the climate of the workshop permit active involvement, shared decision-making, and feedback and support by all participants, planners, presenters, and guests. The list of recommendations and the organization of a consortium of HCEEP minority leaders bear witness to the motivation and sincerity of these leaders and to the success of the workshop. These efforts are commendable and necessary in order to produce realistic solutions to identified problems.

REFERENCES

Carkhuff, R. R. A human technology for group helping processes. Educational Technology, 1973, January, 31-38.

Gagne, R. M. The conditions of learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Illeris, K. Problemorientering og Deltagerstyring. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1974.

Knowles, M. S. The adult education movement in the United States (2nd ed.). Huntington, NY: Krieger Publishing Co., 1977.

Piaget, J. The psychology of intelligence. London: Routledge & Kegal Paul, 1950.

SECTION 2

PRESENTATIONS AND SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

The purpose of this section is to summarize the presentations and small group sessions which occurred at the 1979 HCEEP Minority Leadership Workshop. These summaries represent only a portion of the 22 sessions available to the 23 participants.

INSIGHTS INTO THE LEADERSHIP ROLE

Jane Birckhead, Director of Outreach--Baltimore Early Childhood Learning Continuum, gave the opening address at the Minority Leadership Workshop. She focused upon the sensitive needs of minority leaders and stressed the importance of developing a leadership philosophy. "We are equal to the extent that we use our power. We need to influence others at all levels and achieve a purpose through others," Birckhead stated. She encouraged the participants to look at their leadership behavior in terms of meeting the needs of the individual and the purpose of the project. This can be done by: (a) planning and setting goals with every member of the project team, (b) implementing relevant activities to meet these goals and objectives, and (c) keeping accurate and extensive records of activities which can be used for evaluation. Birckhead summarized, "The leader is a part of the group, but at the same time the leader is held responsible for meeting the goals."

She then turned her attention to some of the reasons behind the new level of interest in minority concerns. Some of the most obvious reasons are: (a) political and legislative issues, (b) new laws, (c) discouraging research results regarding minority populations, (d) increased awareness of the need for unique programs and new curricula designed for minority populations, (e) paucity of well-trained teachers, and (f) the lack of trained minority leaders to deal with these sensitive problems.

Birckhead outlined five critical areas needing attention:

1. The need to provide diversity relevant to the program and curriculum.
2. The need to train project staffs and general educators in how to instruct handicapped minority children.
3. The need to make a more appropriate match between the child and the activity. ("We shouldn't feel sorry for the child," said Birckhead.)

4. The need to arrange for adjustment periods when the child and parents enter a program. More time needs to be given to this process, remembering that it is often a difficult time for the family, which requires immense empathy and skill on the part of the entire staff.
5. The need to help the clients understand their rights and responsibilities in terms of programming for their own handicapped child.

Finally, Birckhead offered the following advice to minority leaders:

1. Make full utilization of the TA agencies. They are there to help you and they want to help you.
2. Select the best people for the task. Ask what you want and then find the "right" person for the task.
3. Develop your theoretical approach. Be specific. Write explicit statements describing your assumptions about children, learning and the organization of the program.
4. Specify the goals and objectives of the program, and identify those people who will be responsible for attaining the outcomes.
5. Adhere to timelines.
6. Test alternative strategies in a systematic manner.
7. Establish links between agencies and rely upon these resources.
8. Develop a model worthy of replication.
9. Continue to review your proposal. Determine if you are doing what you said you would do. If there are changes in the program, ask yourself why and document the alterations.

MANAGING THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN EDUCATIONAL MODEL

Dave Rostetter (BEH Project Officer, Division of Innovation and Development), Bud Moore (WESTAR Project Coordinator), and Pat Trohanis (TADS Project Director) offered different insights regarding the complex task of managing the development of an educational model.

Moore began the presentation by pointing out the many difficulties encountered when combining the dual purposes of a model program. On one hand, services to handicapped children and their families must be provided, and at the same time, a package and/or set of information about the program which is usable for demonstration and dissemination

must be developed. It is often difficult for program leaders to tie together these two elements.

Moore outlined a set of program elements to assist project leaders in meeting both requirements. First, he pointed out the importance of establishing a program philosophy. In order to accomplish this, one needs to examine assumptions about how children learn, what type of learning environment will enhance the learning process, and how to use staff in the most efficient manner. Second, the population being served needs to be defined. This includes an in-depth look at selection criteria, especially in terms of need and type of child being served. Third, one needs to develop and organize the curriculum and instructional process according to the program philosophy and the specific needs of the handicapped children and their families. Furthermore, the rapid growth of knowledge in this area will necessitate continual updating of the curriculum. Fourth, parental involvement is a vital part of each program. Research results indicate the importance of a close working relationship between program and home activities. Every attempt must be made to understand the parent/teacher/child interaction system. Thus, the program needs a clearly specified parent component. Fifth, the program should specify staff roles and include opportunities for staff development. The sixth, and last, element is evaluation. The program should include formative and summative evaluation systems. Formative evaluation will help make necessary program revisions and summative evaluation will demonstrate the effect of the program on child progress.

Moore concluded by stressing the importance of allowing the model to develop and be flexible enough to meet new demands and needs. In his words, "Model development is an ongoing and dynamic process."

Dave Rostetter, the second speaker of this presentation, described BEH's perspective on model development as that of being responsible for stimulating new models for educating handicapped children and maintaining useful models. Considering limited federal funding, each program eventually needs to find other funding sources. Rostetter pointed out that the best way of winning the battle of funds is to incorporate Moore's elements of model development. In other words, make sure the program is based on sound principles, then search for acceptance in the community and keep these people informed about the program. The key elements in selling the program are: identification of available resources, communication, and motivation of the persons responsible for providing services to handicapped children.

Pat Trohanis concluded the presentation by outlining the developmental sequence of a model program across the three-year funding period, especially in terms of demonstration/dissemination opportunities. He pointed out that the first year is usually devoted to "getting everything together," leaving little energy for demonstration/dissemination activities. Typically the second year allows for refinements in the program and tentative plans for demonstration/dissemination activities. By the third year, the program will have matured to "full bloom" and demonstration/dissemination activities will be given high priority.

Trohanis stressed the importance of understanding the ecology of the target population. The target population needs to be informed, socialized and motivated in terms of the program's products, practices and ideas. In order to do this, the program must be integrated into existing community programs. "We need to know about them before we can tell them about us!" It is very important that the contacts be personal and on a one-to-one basis. Informational packages, printed materials, demonstrations, advisory positions, media and inservice training can supplement the personal contacts.

Trohanis encouraged the participants to look creatively at demonstration/dissemination possibilities. Successful demonstration/dissemination activities involve much more than a product. Project staff need to communicate, listen, be sensitive, and negotiate in order to develop products or provide demonstrations. His final advice was to look at available resources and compare these with program needs before planning demonstration/dissemination activities.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION SESSIONS

Following the presentation on managing an educational model, the participants met in four small groups to discuss the content provided in the presentation and relate these ideas to their own experiences and program needs. A feedback panel summarized the major problems and issues of concern generated in the small group sessions. These include: (1) lack of qualified staff with the cultural sensitivity and/or educational skills relevant to minority project needs; (2) necessity to meet the timelines of projects serving children from the middle-class dominant culture; (3) motivation and involvement of minority parents; (4) lack of identification and standardized assessment procedures for multicultural populations; (5) lack of culture-sensitive curricula; and (6) language barriers. (See Appendix C for a

more complete list of problems and issues of concern.) The panel's comments are summarized below.

*Minority projects find themselves playing "catch-up." The unique problems encountered by minority projects take energy and time to solve, but often these problems are not acknowledged by BEH. It is necessary to document these problems and solutions in order to justify the need for more time. As one participant phrased it: "I know I've done a lot, but I can't get credit for it because these things are atypical of most three-year projects." There needs to be a forum for sharing any adaptations in the program due to unusual problems.

*Increased cultural sensitivity between dominant and minority cultures is needed. This concern touched many program areas. For example, curricula need to be adapted for minorities, especially when a second language is involved. Training and involvement of multicultural parents will be different. Assessment tools need to tap relevant multicultural dimensions. Training of project staff may be necessary in order for them to work sensitively with multicultural children and their families. Multicultural consultants are needed to provide the discriminating and critical insights necessary for meeting the needs of multicultural children, families and programs. Nonminorities must become aware of the heterogeneous nature of the minority population. Training institutions have to understand and take into consideration the different needs of minorities when planning their programs. A majority of these concerns revolve around the problem of identifying the manner in which one automatically transfers, assimilates and compares nondominant cultural interpretations with dominant cultural interpretations. In a complex society such as that of the United States, it is inevitable that the dominant and minority cultures will encourage and support differing behaviors and perceptions, based upon their own experiences. These different behaviors and perceptions can cause misunderstandings which hinder solutions to common and very concrete problems. The participants felt that some members of the dominant culture have difficulty accepting the views and strategies of minority leaders. One participant asked: "How can I perceive the situation through the eyes of the dominant culture, and how can I explain the interpretation of the minority culture in a nonthreatening and realistic manner?"

*Problems connected with interagency coordination were a third area of concern. Generally speaking, these problems are not particularly unique to minority-led projects. Some of the common problems appear to be:

a. External constraints within a public school system.
b. Coordinating services for the same population.
c. Making contacts with other agencies.
d. Informing other agencies about the project.
e. Avoiding conflicts between agencies, especially between private and public sectors.

*The fourth general area of concern was related to continuation funding. Many of the participants voiced dissatisfaction with the three-year funding period. The minority leaders indicated that the unusual circumstances encountered by some minority projects justify alternative ways of funding these projects. Perhaps the three-year period of BEH funding is inadequate. The minority leaders encouraged BEH to extend funds beyond the third year. In any event, it is necessary to establish a network of funding possibilities at national, state and local levels.

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT/COMMUNICATION AND PROBLEM SOLVING SKILLS

Barbara Richardson and Torcey Wiley, affiliated with the Infant/Family Education Project at the Charles R. Drew Postgraduate Medical School in Los Angeles, California, were the resource persons for this session. At the onset of the workshop, the participants had indicated a desire to focus upon common issues of concern as early as possible. In order to accommodate this need, it was agreed that this session would attempt to identify and address these concerns--a slightly different direction than originally planned.

Probably the most important outcome of the session was the development of the minority leadership task force. The idea for such a group grew from a realization that the issues under consideration could not be adequately addressed at the workshop. The number, complexity and scope of the problems would require long-term and ongoing attention. Furthermore, minority leaders would have to work closely with BEH. The first step toward building a cooperative effort between BEH and minority leaders was the identification of minority needs and resources. Thereafter, long- and short-range goals could be established.

During this session the following needs and concerns specific to minority projects were identified:

1. Relevant assessment instruments to measure growth and development of minority populations.
2. Culturally sensitive curricula.
3. Identification of qualified minority personnel to work with minority projects.
4. Funds to attract personnel to hard-to-reach areas.
5. Increased involvement of unsophisticated parents in the program.
6. Availability of funds to help train parents about their rights and responsibilities for educating their handicapped children (P.L. 94-142).
7. Acceptance of minority project leaders working with non-minority staff.
8. Acceptance of minority leaders by parents of predominantly non-minority programs.
9. Identification of other minority leaders to serve as consultants.
10. Development of a support network among minority leaders.
11. Staff development programs to address and increase multicultural sensitivity.
12. Training institutions (medicine, psychology, social work, etc.) to include courses and inservice programs wherein students can become aware of and sensitive to the unique needs and attitudes of minorities.

PROGRAM PLANNING AND REVIEW PROCEDURES/RECORD KEEPING

Henry Hankerson, Howard University, led both sessions. The following description is a synopsis of the handouts provided to the participants.

Research/demonstration programs provide an extensive and varied array of services for the total development of human potential. Early childhood special education programs are forerunners in exemplary programs for young children and their parents. Therefore, it is necessary to engage in program planning and review in an effort to ensure qualitative models. These programs have better chances for success if they are properly planned and administered. Program quality depends upon a rational, conceptual, and systematic approach. Effective program planning, review, proposal writing and implementation begin with the nature and extent of shared leadership, conceptualization of a model, utilization of staff, system analysis,

curriculum, record keeping and reporting systems. These factors are interwoven to depict a process approach. This type of organization will extend the probability of success for minority projects.

Hankerson discussed several leadership styles befitting of project leaders in exemplary early childhood special education programs. Activities depicting roles and responsibilities of staff dictate a need for leaders who supervise and administer program matters that are concerned with both people and task. An organization with clearly defined functions increases the effectiveness and efficiency of a staff. It also frees the staff from spending time on "emergencies," from mechanical problems which will delay program implementation, from complaints that "no one informed me," and from uncoordinated efforts in providing services. Organizational formats vary from program to program in accordance with goals, philosophy, funding sources, nature of the program and children served, location, and administrators and staff personnel.

Undoubtedly the quality of the staff will determine, to a high degree, the excellence of the program. Ideally, the staff will feel secure and accomplished in utilizing their job skills. Program quality and job satisfaction are closely connected with the extent to which staff can: (a) fulfill their specific duties, (b) work within the philosophical framework of the program, and (c) share similar beliefs about the program's philosophy and goals. A continuous analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the program will provide a basis for improving the qualifications of personnel.

Hankerson also pointed out that minority projects begin at a disadvantage. Past reports on exemplary programs show that Blacks and other minorities are not in the mainstream of funded programs. He concluded that this automatically puts a minority leader at a disadvantage. Therefore, it is necessary to state the uniqueness of one's ideas and record and document that uniqueness. These specific suggestions were offered to minority leaders:

1. Don't burden yourself with lesser priorities; deal with administrative functions.
2. Share your leadership. Delegate, don't be a "Lone-Ranger."
3. Sit down and discuss the program model with the staff.
4. Document program activities and decisions.
5. Provide continuous program review.

6. Translate theory into practice.
7. Substantiate every component of the program and assign staff roles/activities.
8. Share ideas with the staff and others.
9. Provide skill-building sessions.
10. Develop a guideline with easy steps for year one, two, and three.

FISCAL MANAGEMENT

Leonard Fitts, Special Service Division of Camden (New Jersey) Public Schools, and Tal Black, TADS, led this session.

Following a review of the federal fiscal system, Fitts described and compared other typical institutional fiscal systems. The implications and adaptations of these systems were applied to smaller projects. Fitts then discussed some typical problems encountered by minority projects and suggested alternative solutions. One example was the need for additional funds when providing services to remote areas. He suggested that project leaders make a request for additional funds, but stressed the importance of providing adequate documentation which would demonstrate the need for these services and a rationale which would justify the additional expenditures.

Tal Black presented an overview and rationale for cost analysis as an integral part of fiscal management. He outlined how cost analysis can improve fiscal efficiency, contribute to an understanding of how a program operates, and provide cost information for seeking continuation funds. He described a planning model for cost analysis that takes into account both the cost information needs of the project and the various program components being analyzed.

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

At the end of the first workshop day, the participants gathered to discuss and review the many issues of concern identified thus far. Many of the same problems were debated: cultural sensitivity, recruitment of staff, BEH policies, parental involvement, adapting to the conceptual frameworks of two cultures, and assertive leadership behavior. Gradually, it became apparent that the issues of common concern revolved around two general areas: (1) providing services to minority children and their families, and (2) minority leadership roles and skills.

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT/COMMUNICATION AND PROBLEM SOLVING SKILLS

Philip Chinn, Special Assistant on Minority Concerns, Council for Exceptional Children, was the resource person for the second session of Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills. He chose to focus on the decision-making process. The session was divided into two parts. First, after pointing out that there are many ways to make decisions, Chinn briefly described the seven steps he uses in decision-making situations. (This process is described in Two-Way Talking With Parents of Special Children, by P. C. Chinn, J. Winn, and R. H. Walters, published by C. V. Mosby, 1978.)

Step 1: The dialogue
This is a critical period. Allow enough time for the problem to surface. Listen for both content and feeling messages.

Step 2: Clear statement of problem
Decide what the real problem is. Other problems may also be identified, but the major problem must be given priority.

Step 3: Consideration of options
All possible options are encouraged and accepted. Everyone brainstorms. There should be no judgment or criticism of possible options. Allow for the knowledge, creativity, and experience of every participant to come forth.

Step 4: Establishment of evaluation criteria
"This crucial step includes identification of the goal and the criteria for reaching it in order that the best option, alternative, or solution may be chosen. The criteria must be relevant to the situation and appropriate to the persons involved. Best means -- what will work most effectively in this situation with these persons?" (from handout)

Step 5: The decision
Using the criteria agreed upon, select one option. All persons involved agree to the decision.

Step 6: Allocation and action
Allocate necessary resources and authority.

Step 7: A time for assessment
Set a time for evaluation of how the solution is working. This allows for the identification of unknown variables which may influence the decision. Monitoring also allows the person to provide positive feedback and contributes to future planning.

The second part of this session allowed the participants to apply these decision-making steps to the solution of an actual problem.

LIAISON WITH OTHER AGENCIES

Setsu Furuno, from Project TEECH at the University of Hawaii, was the resource person for this session. The major portion of this discussion focused upon issues or barriers related to establishing communication and cooperation with other agencies. The following questions were addressed:

1. How do you get other agencies to accept your project?
2. How do you overcome racial barriers?
3. How do you identify the power structure within other agencies?
4. How do you counteract jealousy between programs serving the same population?
5. How do you overcome personality conflicts and different theoretical approaches regarding the "appropriate" ways to provide services to handicapped children?
6. How do you develop an effective communication network among agencies?
7. How do you become familiar with the political dimensions of various interest groups and use this information to your advantage?

BEH AND EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Marilyn Semmes, Division of Assistance to States, was the resource person for this session. The four divisions of BEH (Division of Personnel Preparation, Division of Media Services, Division of Innovation and Development, Division of Assistance to States) were described in terms of focus, function, and early childhood programs. The history and rationale of the Preschool Incentive Grants were reviewed. The information was related to the various ways federal monies can be used in different states. The participants were encouraged to ask specific questions regarding their own funding problems. This provided an excellent opportunity for the participants to give and receive additional information pertaining to their own projects, as well as to hear about the situations in other states.

EARLY EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED: THE ECOLOGY OF THE PROFESSIONAL FIELD

Elouise Jackson, from TADS, reviewed the resource centers for minority-related materials and the agencies for

obtaining curriculum materials for minorities. Familiarity with these resources can be useful in a number of ways: to expand staff development programs; to identify trends and issues in the field; to enhance one's ability to look critically and analytically at the status of early childhood education; and to increase one's ability to converse and interact with colleagues.

Project leaders were advised to share ideas that they have found effective in working with minority children and families and to publish and disseminate information about their programs. They were encouraged to pursue possibilities for making formal presentations at BEH workshops and national organization meetings and to submit articles to the newsletters of the technical assistance agencies. Procedures for developing and disseminating information were reviewed.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION AND FUNDING SOURCES

On the second day of the workshop, a panel of experts addressed issues related to federal legislation and funding sources for early education of the handicapped. The panel members were: Barbara Smith (Council for Exceptional Children), Jane DeWeerd (BEH Division of Innovation and Development), and Rosa Trapp-Dukes (Howard University). Pat Trohanis (TADS) served as chairperson.

Barbara Smith reviewed funding sources at national, state and local levels, as well as in private organizations. She pointed out that there are approximately fifty different sources of funding for preschool handicapped education, and that ten of these are specifically directed toward minority populations. She urged the participants to become active in policy-making decisions at the local level. The importance of collecting cost-effectiveness data and relating this information to the appropriate audience was emphasized.

Jane DeWeerd reviewed other federal resources and encouraged the participants to contact her about specific needs.

Rosa Trapp-Dukes offered the following practical advice to the participants:

1. Be knowledgeable in the field of early education and special education.
2. Become familiar with the outstanding minority individuals in your local area.

3. Develop your own network.
4. Know the national, state and local legislation.
5. Prepare a two-page summary of your program and distribute it widely.
6. Use informal contacts wisely.
7. Develop documentation and evaluation skills.
8. Select the best people in your field to serve on the Advisory Council.
9. Insure community involvement by including local people on the Advisory Council and other planning committees.
10. Match your needs with funding sources.

The major message of the panel members was to examine funding sources and to present practical strategies for linking the project leaders to available sources.

SYNTHESIS OF ISSUES

On the last day of the workshop, Marie Gaasholt (WESTAR) presented a brief summary of the many issues identified at the workshop. The problems and issues of concern revolved around the following eleven categories. (A list of the specific issues of concern is provided in Appendix C.)

1. Adequate training and inservice activities for staff, consultants, and paraprofessionals.
2. Cooperation and feedback between BEH and project leaders.
3. Leadership activities and responsibilities.
4. Interagency coordination.
5. Sensitivity across cultures.
6. Parental involvement.
7. Use of consultants.
8. Meeting the needs of multicultural populations.
9. Designing sensitive curricula and instructional programs.
10. Documentation and evaluation.
11. Identification of alternative funding sources.

Generally speaking, the issues fell under two areas of concern. First, considerable energy was directed toward identifying and examining the unique problems encountered by projects serving minority children and their families. The needs for increased cultural sensitivity, appropriate assessment techniques and curricula, and qualified staff are only a few of the specific variables falling under this general area.

Second, it became apparent that the experiences encountered by a minority leader may often be different

from those experienced by a non-minority leader. Minority leaders must rely upon extensive amounts of documentation in order to describe and justify major portions of their unique programs. They must develop assertive leadership skills and organize a supportive network among fellow minority leaders in order to sell their programs to others. And they must share the responsibility of building a closer cooperation among minority projects, and among minority projects and BEH and the TA agencies.

But in the final analysis, the minority leaders participating in this workshop pointed out that the leadership, direction, and self-definition of the complex minority population must come from within. That leadership cannot exist on the support of the majority, but must draw its support--economically, politically, socially and psychologically--from the broad and rich base within the minority communities.

Even a casual examination of the complex problems presented by the minority leaders clearly indicates that further serious debate and discussion cannot be avoided. The list of recommendations and the organization of a consortium of HCEEP minority leaders bear witness to the motivation and sincerity of these leaders. These efforts are not only commendable, but deserve the continued support of BEH, the TA agencies and other project leaders in an attempt to learn from one another and produce reasonable solutions to identified problems.

SECTION 3
WORKSHOP EVALUATION

This section summarizes the workshop evaluation data, including all evaluative comments received from the participants.

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

In order to give the workshop participants an opportunity to provide formal feedback to BEH, the technical assistance agencies and other workshop leaders, a three-part evaluation questionnaire (Appendix F) was developed. The first section listed the original workshop purposes. A five-point scale allowed participants to rate the extent to which each purpose was met. The next section listed each planned large and small-group session, with five-point scales to rate the quality and usefulness of each session. The final section included six open-ended questions and a general rating of satisfaction with the workshop. Participants were encouraged to complete the questionnaire at the conference or to return it to TADS within one week.

EVALUATION RESULTS

Completed questionnaires were received from nineteen participants, primarily HCEEP demonstration and SIG project personnel from across the nation. Because there were only a few responses from any one geographic or program subgroup, no attempt was made to analyze the data by subgroups. The results which follow, therefore, represent all nineteen questionnaires which were received.

PURPOSES ACHIEVED

Table 1 presents the mean and range of ratings for each workshop purpose. Generally, the workshop was seen as having achieved its purposes in a more-than-adequate fashion. The most positive rating (mean = 4.61) was given to "identifying issues of common concern." The least positive ratings (mean = 3.78) were given to "facilitating the participation of minority professionals in the future development of programs...." Only a very few ratings lower than "adequate" were received.

TABLE 1
EXTENT TO WHICH THE WORKSHOP
MET ITS PURPOSES

Purpose	Mean*	Range*
1. To promote the development of leadership skills in directing an HCEEP project, and in contributing to the HCEEP network and the field of early childhood/special education in general.	4.24	3-5
2. To provide an opportunity for workshop participants to share project resources among themselves.	4.00	2-5
3. To identify issues that are of common concern to HCEEP minority staff and to develop recommendations for addressing those issues.	4.61	3-5
4. To facilitate the participation of minority professionals in the future development of early education programs for the handicapped, especially within HCEEP.	3.78	2-5

* Ratings on a 5-point scale, with 5 being the most positive.

QUALITY AND USEFULNESS

Table 2 displays the mean quality and usefulness ratings for each planned session and the range of ratings. (The focus of each session has been described in Section 2.) All workshop sessions received a mean rating of "3" or higher. There was considerable variation in the ratings and the participants were not in agreement on a number of ratings, as indicated by the range of scores.

Several sessions and discussion groups were perceived as particularly useful and well done. The "Personnel Management/Communication" session received very high ratings, as did all small group discussion sessions. "Program Planning and Review" sessions were also highly rated. As mentioned previously, the participants expressed a need for assistance in program management, and the ratings in Table 2 indicate that the sessions related to management were useful to them. Participants also rated the opportunities for open discussion of issues and concern as very useful and very well conducted. While these sessions stand out, it should be noted that all sessions were useful to many participants, and that they were generally considered to be of high quality.

The high ratings received for the discussion sessions are borne in the next portion of this report. The responses to each of the open-ended questions are presented in full with only minor editing. The responses stand on their own as evidence of the positive results of the workshop and the energy and commitment of the participants. Comments which were similar in content are highlighted for each question, and a summary of the comments and other data complete this section.

MOST POSITIVE ASPECTS

Comments provided in the third section of the evaluation questionnaire cover a range of subjects, from the content of workshop sessions through an appreciation of open attitudes and better relationships. Participants listed these as most positive aspects of the workshop:

- -The interaction of leaders and really expressing the true concerns of all those involved, and trying to develop a consortium.
- -Opportunity to discuss problems and issues specific to minority projects.

TABLE 2
QUALITY AND USEFULNESS
OF WORKSHOP SESSIONS

Session Title	Quality*	Range*	Usefulness*	Range*
Insights into the Leadership Role	3.50	2-5	3.16	1-5
Managing the Development of an Educational Model	3.80	2-5	3.77	2-5
Small Group Discussion Session	4.33	2-5	4.40	2-5
Feedback Panel from Small Groups	4.07	3-5	4.00	3-5
Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills--I**	4.57	3-5	4.33	3-5
Program Planning and Review Procedures/Record Keeping--I	4.60	4-5	4.55	4-5
Fiscal Management	4.40	2-5	4.22	2-5
Sharing of Resources among Projects	4.15	2-5	3.27	1-5
Panel on Legislation and Funding	4.25	3-5	4.36	3-5
Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills--II	4.67	4-5	4.57	4-5
Program Planning and Review Procedures/ Record Keeping--II	4.20		4.00	2-5
Liaison with Other Agencies	3.40	2-5	4.00	4
BEH and Early Childhood Education	4.08	3-5	4.10	2-5
Early Education of the Handicapped: The Ecology of the Professional Field	4.10	2-5	4.00	2-5
Discussion of Issues of Common Concern	4.90	4-5	4.56	3-5
Morning Discussions and Recommendations	4.71	4-5	4.75	4-5

* Ratings on a 5-point scale, with 5 being the most positive.

**Session content revised to include preliminary discussion of issues and concerns.

-"Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills" session was the most positive part of the workshop because we need to know how to communicate, clearly state problems, consider options, and set criteria to solve problems in order to provide the best services for children.

-The most positive part of the workshop was the discussion related to federal legislation as it relates to early education of the handicapped.

-Sharing concerns among the program directors who serve minority populations. I believe it is one of the first efforts made to address some of the unique circumstances that often delay and hamper the development of a demonstration model.

-Wednesday morning small group recommendations.

-Process and content of workshop. Hearing frustrations of minority leaders. I think people moved from frustration level to realizing changes come through proposing specifics.

-Sensitization to minority issues that are very strongly felt by minority leaders in HCEEP projects.

-Meeting and establishing relationships with leadership persons, BEH staff, and technical assistance agency staff.

-Open discussion.

-Being able to meet and talk to other minority leaders and express concerns.

-Getting together and formulating our common needs.

-The emergence of common issues facing minority leaders, and the development of concrete proposals to expand the impact of this conference.

-Attending a workshop where all participants shared the role of minorities, consequently individual abilities were accepted rather than having to prove them to each other as is the case when attending most other conferences.

-Material presented for the most part was very applicable.

-The cohesiveness of the group and the open attitudes of the presenters. I always enjoy working with BEH, WESTAR, and TADS staff.

-Talking to staff of the technical assistance agency for consensus on project needs.

-The differences in perceptions between BEH and the minority leadership as to workshop purposes and how they were to be fulfilled brought about an atmosphere which enhanced the identification and development of a vehicle by which the issues were addressed.

-Special issues and concerns of minority leaders as devised by the Minority Leadership Consortium.

TOPICS FOR FUTURE WORKSHOP

The participants were asked for topics to be addressed if another minority workshop were to be held. A number of different suggestions were made, but the major theme appears to be a request for follow-up on the identified problems and recommendations from this workshop. A second common suggestion is additional help with project development and management.

-Background and historical overview and discussion of issues such as trust-sensitivity training, data and resources on culturally diverse childrearing and parenting behaviors, methods for modification of human services programs and responses to minority children and families.

-Another workshop should focus on: (1) extension of funds for 4th year; (2) direct services to train more paraprofessionals on at least six types of screening instruments; (3) more inservice on parenting approaches.

-Management styles. This is an area of great need for people who have relatively little management experience.

-Leadership and management skills specific to problems encountered by minority leaders. A follow-up report on this 1979 conference.

-Leadership and management skills.

-More in-depth discussions on managing the development of an educational model.

-Continuing (ongoing) workshops for minority leaders. Leadership skills (communication, etc.). Training for minority leaders (legal protection,

legislation, etc.). Extensive administrative and financial management training. Cultural aspects to leadership training.

-Delineating what separates minority populations from the majority in terms of specific unique characteristics. Grant preparation for other agencies or divisions within BEH. Preparing progress reports. Procedures for stimulating new proposals from other minority leaders.

-Topics should be based on the problems and recommendations that were made at this conference.

-Effective utilization of minority leaders in influencing the future of minority projects.

-Identify minority priorities, share project documents, and expand our network of resources.

-Follow-up/reporting on recommendations made at this workshop and "how-to" sessions on how to implement our own recommendations from this conference.

-Dealing with specific issues, what are the unique qualities of these projects? Look beyond HCEEP projects and pull in other minority leaders in the field.

-Discussion on cultural mores, regarding handicapping conditions.

-Some of the issues and concerns addressed. A unified effort must be made to get universities and colleges to be responsive to training programs for the paraprofessionals within our programs (e.g., Associate of Arts), along with coursework that will sensitive students in language assessment of minority populations, etc.

-How to do a better job for minority children.

-Issues and recommendations generated from this conference.

FORMAT AND SCHEDULING

When asked for recommendations for possible future workshops, a number of participants thought that the format and schedule for this workshop should be used again. Others suggested changes, such as more time for discussion and sharing of concerns, and increased involvement of participants in planning and leading the sessions.

-An intensive assessment should be done first. When an agenda is formulated, it should be sent to all participants for their comments.

-Greater opportunity for each participant to engage in leadership activities. Greater problem-solving sessions. More time to work on priority issues of participants as a group.

-The format for this workshop was appropriate.

-Scheduling was good.

-Longer time periods for information-giving presentations--1½ hours is too short. Maybe ½- to 1-day mini-courses on a specific topic, either before or after the main proceedings, for interested persons (e.g., 1-day workshop on Sunday on communication and problem-solving, ½-day workshop on Wednesday afternoon on fiscal management).

-Not keeping on time punishes those people who run on time. It's bad relations, especially when BEH presenters are kept waiting.

-More field input and a more flexible agenda to provide for emerging change.

-Additional time to discuss topical areas.

-More time for forum.

-Have many BEH staff present on last day to receive summary of input.

-More time to discuss needs we feel that are important to us.

-No suggestions. Especially appreciated the participative nature of the conference. Also benefited immensely from the "wrap-up" following each session. Especially appreciated TADS/WESTAR/BEH's flexibility in responding to unanticipated conference directions.

-Allow more flexibility in scheduling to allow participants to meet and share ideas under the "bull session" heading. Have an open forum early in the conference in which topics of concern could be raised and discussed face to face, with suggestions which could be addressed by a presentation later in the conference by the TA providers.

-None. The length of the daily program was just right.

-This was A-O.K., except get everyone to attend all of the sessions.

-More time on first day for issues of common concern.

-More minority involvement in the planning stage.

WORKSHOP DOCUMENT

Participants gave their opinions on the minority workshop document. A strong appeal for documenting all concerns and recommendations can be noted in the comments which follow.

-Please, please, report the feedback verbatim. In other words, do not revise the content.

-Verbatim recording and reporting to projects of the workshop evaluation (tabulations), issues, and Recommendations.

-The formation of a Minority Coalition with these objectives:

1. To capitalize on the skills of minority leadership.
2. To enhance unity and enthusiasm generated at this conference.

-Recommendations within the conference structure and recommendations developed by the task force or consortium. Texts of the presentations. Information from this evaluation.

-Position paper, session summaries, recommendations, and the additional input following the recommendations section of the conference (the "who to contact," etc.).

-The recommendations that were made and the action that is being taken to implement them.

-Simple language.

-Recommendations and concerns raised. Results of workshop questionnaire.

WORTHWHILE TIME AND EFFORT

Participants unanimously voted the workshop as worthy of their personal investment of time and energy. Additional comments follow.

-Yes. Excellent opportunity to demonstrate or exemplify leadership skills. Looking forward to meeting in December.

-Yes. Much more so than anticipated. BEH should be commended on its efforts to allow for time needed for the synthesis of interest, support and identification of those issues which were critical to the minority leadership members and resulted in a most unique level of sharing and collaboration.

-Yes. Thank you for your extended cooperation this time. I saw that a genuine amount of interest was generated by all, and we are all becoming more familiar with each other.

-Yes. It was most productive. A review of the thrusts and "how to" was timely for this time of year when one tends to "burn out."

-Yes. Other than the useful information which I gathered, it allowed me the opportunity to interact with project directors who shared a great deal more than concerns. It was also extremely valuable to me to see how much commonality exists across cultures.

-Yes. One of the most productive conferences I've attended. Many conferences leave you with an abundance of information but no direction to take it. This conference has provided both, and in addition, has afforded us our initial steps in our own network development.

-Yes. I feel we need another conference within a six-month period.

-Yes. I hope that there is an effort made to follow-up on the issues that were presented and to act on the recommendations that were generated. I would like to see this as a joint effort by BEH and project directors.

-Yes. A better understanding of common concerns was generated.

-Yes. This is a good opportunity for us to share our concerns and needs, so we can recommend them to BEH and TA centers.

-Yes. It was the "tip of an iceberg." Continued planning toward this effort is greatly needed. There is considerable need to move away from

"tokenism" to full integration and opportunity for minorities in HCEEP.

-Yes. I have been oriented, although not thoroughly, to what an educational model should encompass. I have been able to share my problems and information on minority people with experiences in developmental disabilities.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Finally, the participants were invited to make additional comments concerning the workshop. Their responses range from requests to receive the proceedings document (with verbatim comments included) to an appreciation of the interpersonal aspects of the workshop.

-Although sometimes I feel alone in working with minority developmentally disabled people, it has been good for me because I have begun to know others doing the same thing. I can now seek help and know where to go. Just getting to know the people was good experience for me.

-It is my opinion that both TA agencies and BEH, but especially the TA agencies, need to develop a greater awareness concerning the unique needs of minority handicapped children and their families.

-If another conference is provided, I feel it should take place in the very early fall.

-I enjoyed getting to know project and TA staff and hope to have further contacts with them.

-Additional time for discussion is needed.

-Send me the report on the meeting.

-TADS and WESTAR should make a commitment to include as many of the recommendations as possible from the task force into their job scope proposal to BEH.

-Bringing together minority leaders is a real step forward for all concerned. Most minority leaders got there by fighting their way. Bringing a group of mavericks together can be dangerous. I initially sensed a great deal of "us and them" which was a minority reaction but, as concern by the TA/BEH staff was demonstrated, this feeling dissipated.

-I have high regard for those persons who organized and implemented this conference. This type of workshop can be rather threatening.

-Everything was better this time around. TA staff were extremely patient and cooperative and this was my first encounter in person with them. Thank you for bearing with our frustrations. And we were not using you as sounding walls. Maybe too it was small enough to get to know everyone. You were all kind, receptive, and for a change we did the talking. It's the best one yet for me. Bless you all. And this made it meaningful to us to be able to verbalize, etc.

-I would recommend that more representatives from BEH be present on the last conference day to hear the wrap-up and recommendations on issues that have emerged from the conference.

-Please report comments verbatim.

-After the Minority Leadership Consortium is established, its members should be given an opportunity to become more active in the planning.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A tabulation of the numerical data from the evaluation questionnaire has been presented. The data indicate that, for the most part, the workshop achieved its purposes, especially in "identifying issues that are of common concern to HCEEP minority staff and in developing recommendations for addressing those needs." Participants rated the quality and usefulness of the workshop sessions as being generally well above average. Several workshop sessions received especially high ratings. The sessions on "Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills" and "Program Planning and Review" were well received, as were the open discussion sessions where issues and concerns were raised.

It is from the comments, however, that the full range of the participants' opinions can be seen. They provide a great deal of evaluative information, and have been reported essentially as they were given to us. The participants appreciated the opportunity to discuss problems and issues in an open forum. They commented positively on a number of individual sessions which provided additional learning opportunities in project management and

problem-solving. Participants liked the accepting atmosphere which enabled the group to address issues early in the meeting. Participants reported that they liked the format and scheduling of the workshop, although several would like more time for discussion in a future workshop. Requests were made that future workshops be done with increased minority involvement in planning and leadership. Regarding the content of this document, the participants voiced a strong request for all feedback to be reported verbatim. All persons attending felt that the workshop was worth the time and effort invested.

The generally high level of participants' satisfaction is expressed in their satisfaction ratings--82 percent of the participants gave the workshop a rating of "4" or "5," either very satisfied or extremely satisfied (mean rating 4.29). These evaluation data confirm that, as stated previously, a positive "first step" has been made toward developing more network participation by minority leaders.

APPENDIX A

HCEEP MINORITY LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP
May 21-23, 1979
Sheraton National Hotel
Arlington, Virginia

AGENDA

Monday, May 21

7:45- 8:30	Registration and Continental Breakfast
8:30- 9:15	Introductions and Overview of Workshop--Tal Black Insights into the Leadership Role--Jane Birckhead
9:15-10:15	Managing the Development of an Educational Model--Dave Rostetter, Bud Moore, Pat Trohanis
10:15-10:30	BREAK
10:30-11:30	Small Group Discussion Session
11:30-11:45	BREAK
11:45-12:15	Feedback Panel from Small Groups
12:15- 1:30	LUNCH (group luncheon)
1:30- 3:00	Concurrent Sessions 1. Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills--Barbara Richardson, Torcey Wiley 2. Program Planning and Review Procedures/Record Keeping--Henry Hankerson 3. Fiscal Management--Leonard Fitts
3:00- 3:15	BREAK
3:15- 4:30	Sharing of Resources Among Projects

Tuesday, May 22

7:45- 8:30	Continental Breakfast
8:30- 8:45	Overview of the Day and Announcements
8:45-10:15	Federal Legislation Relating to Early Education of the Handicapped and Funding Sources for Early Education of the Handicapped--Jane DeWeerd, Barbara Smith, Rosa Trapp-Dukes, Pat Trohanis
10:15-10:30	BREAK
10:30-12:00	Concurrent Sessions 1. Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills--Philip Chinn 2. Program Planning and Review Procedures/Record Keeping--Henry Hankerson 3. Liaison with Other Agencies--Setsu Furuno
12:00- 1:30	LUNCH (group luncheon)
1:30- 2:30	Concurrent Sessions 1. BEH and Early Childhood Education--Marilyn Semmes 2. Early Education of the Handicapped: The Ecology of the Professional Field--Elouise Jackson
2:30- 2:45	BREAK
2:45- 3:45	Concurrent Sessions (repeat of 1:30-2:30)
3:45- 4:00	BREAK
4:00- 5:00	Discussion of Issues of Common Concern

Wednesday, May 23

7:45- 8:30	Continental Breakfast
8:30- 8:45	Overview of the Day
8:45- 9:15	Synthesis of Issues Raised During the Workshop--Marie Gaasholt
9:15-10:15	Small Group Sessions to Generate Recommendations
10:15-10:30	BREAK
10:30-11:30	Reports from Small Groups
11:30-12:00	Wrap-up and Workshop Evaluation
12:00	Lunch (on your own) and Depart

WORKSHOP GROUP MEMBERS

Monday, May 21st
Small Group Discussion Sessions (10:30-11:30)

Group 1
Kyo R. Jhin
Marge Ford
Cecelia Balone
Torcey Wiley
Tom Maes
Elaine Vowels
Reginald Robinson
Leonard Fitts
Ed Wilson, Facilitator

Group 2
Alma Callaway
Setsu Furuno
Barbara Robinson
Edith Kong-Lam
Rhonda Chino
Mike Ortiz
Martha Lausch
Sandra Gales-Young, Facilitator

Group 3
Jane Birckhead
Peggy Robinson-Wilson
Mary Cavazos
Genoa McPhatter
Marcia Johnson
Eugene Gorman
Diane Wright
Elouise Jackson, Facilitator

Group 4
Debra West
Pacquita Roberts
Marilyn Gorospe
Carmen Vazquez
Yuki Okuma
Pedro Grimaldo
Barbara Richardson
Marie Gaasholt, Facilitator

Floaters
Bud Moore
Pat Trohanis
Dave Rostetter
Tal Black

Concurrent Session (1:30-3:00)

Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills

Cecelia Balone	Marcia Johnson
Rhonda Chino	Reginald Robinson
Setsu Furuno	Marcia Johnson, Facilitator
Marcia Johnson	Torcey Wiley, Resource
Tom Maes	Barbara Richardson, Resource

Program Planning and Review Procedures/Record Keeping

Debra West	Yuki Okuma
Carmen Vazquez	Genoa McPhatter
Mary Cavazos	Martha Laush
Edith Kong-Lam	Henry Hankerson, Resource
Tom Maes	Sandra Gales-Young, Facilitator

Fiscal Management

Mary Ford	Alma Callaway
Eugene Gorman	Jane Birckhead
Marilyn Gorospe	Kyo Jhin
Pedro Grimaldo	Diane Wright
Peggy Robinson-Wilson	Leonard Fitts, Resource
Mike Ortiz	Tal Black, Resource
	Ed Wilson, Facilitator

Tuesday, May 22nd
Concurrent Sessions (10:30-12:00)

Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills

Debra West	Yuki Okuma
Diane Wright	Genoa McPhatter
Carmen Vazquez	Kyo Jhin
Mary Cavazos	Philip Chinn, Resource
Edith Kong-Lam	Marie Gaasholt, Facilitator
Tom Maes	

Program Planning and Review Procedures/Record Keeping

Marge Ford	Torcey Wiley
Eugene Gorman	Mike Ortiz
Marilyn Gorospe	Henry Hankerson, Resource
Pedro Grimaldo	Bertram Coppock, Facilitator

Liaison with Other Agencies

Cecelia Balone	Marcia Johnson
Rhonda Chino	Alma Callaway
Barbara Richardson	Setsu Furuno, Resource
Peggy Robinson-Wilson	Ed Wilson, Facilitator

NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

PROJECT PARTICIPANTS

Kyo R. Jhin
Top of Alabama Regional
Education Service Agency
3125 University Drive West,
Suite 2-C
Huntsville, Alabama 35805

Marge Ford
Project TRACE
1020 I Street
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

Cecelia Balone
Deinstitutionalization Project
P.O. Box 1586
Window Rock, Arizona 86515

Torcey Wiley
Infant/Family Education Project
Department of Pediatrics
Charles R. Drew Postgraduate
Medical School
320 East 111th Street, Rm. 232
Los Angeles, California 90059

Tom Maes
A Music-Oriented Intervention
Program
602 East 64th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80229

Elaine Vowels
Handicapped Infant
Intervention Project
D.C. General Hospital
Pediatrics Hospital
4th Floor, West Wing
1900 Massachusetts Ave., S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003

Alma Callaway
Preschool Demonstration Project
for Handicapped Children
Fort Valley State College
P. O. Box 5367
Fort Valley, Georgia 31030

Setsu Furuno
TEECH
University of Hawaii
School of Public Health
Biomed C105M
1960 East West Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Marcia Johnson
Division of Special Education
State Dept. of Education
229 Statehouse
Indianapolis, Indiana 46207

Edith Kong-Lam
Orleans Model for Preschool
Handicapped
703 Carondet Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

Diane Wright
Early Educational Intervention &
Responsible Parenting Project
Children's Guild, Inc.
5921 Smith Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21209

Jane Birckhead
Martha Lausch
Reginald Robinson
Division for Exceptional Children
Baltimore City Public Schools
2300 N. Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Peggy Robinson-Wilson
Debra West
Early Intervention Program
Dept. of Special Education
University of Missouri
515 South Sixth Street
Columbia, Missouri 65211

Pacquita Roberts
Bureau of Program Development
and Special Projects
State Department of Education
P. O. Box 2019
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Rhonda Chino
Marilyn Gorospe
Acoma Early Intervention Project
P. O. Box 307
Pueblo of Acoma
Acomita, New Mexico 87034

Eugene Gorman
Navajo Special Education Early Childhood Development Program
Navajo Division of Education
P. O. Box 1257
Shiprock, New Mexico 87420

Yuki Okuma
Project MATCH ME!
East River Montessori School
577 Grand Street
New York, New York 10002

Mike Ortiz
I Can/Will Do It Project
Appalachian State University
Edwin Duncan Hall
Boone, North Carolina 28606

Carmen Vazquez
Department of Public Instruction
Programma Education Especial
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00919

Mary E. Cavazos
Pedro Grimaldo
The Handicapped Early Childhood Assistance Project
Cameron Willacy Counties Community Projects, Inc.
940 E. Washington, Suite 204
Brownsville, Texas 78520

Genoa McPhatter
Barbara Robinson
CHICS Program
Chesapeake Public Schools
2107 East Liberty Street
Chesapeake, Virginia 23324

RESOURCE PERSONS

Barbara Richardson
1932 Midtolhian Drive
Altadena, California 91001

Henry Hankerson
Howard University
School of Education, Room 206
Washington, D.C. 20059

Rosa Trapp-Dukes
Howard University
Center for Study of Handicapped Children and Youth
2935 Upton N.W.
Holy Cross Bldg., Room 120
Washington, D.C. 20008

Leonard Fitts
Special Services
Camden Public Schools
3rd and Walnut Streets
Camden, New Jersey 08102

Philip Chinn
Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091

Barbara Smith
Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091

MOTON INSTITUTE

Sandra Gales-Young
Bertram A. Coppock, Jr.
Robert R. Moton Memorial Institute
2001 S Street N.W., Suite 601
Washington, D.C. 20009

BEH

Jane DeWeerd, Division of Innovation and Development
Dave Rostetter, Division of Innovation and Development
Ed Wilson, Division of Innovation and Development
Marilyn Semmes, Division of Assistance to States
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
6th and D Street, Donohoe Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20202

WESTAR

Marie Gaasholt
Melvin G. (Bud) Moore
University District Bldg., JD-06
1107 N.E 45th Street, Suite 215
Seattle, Washington 98105

TADS

Tal Black
Elouise Jackson
Pat Trohanis
500 NCNB Plaza
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

APPENDIX B

MINORITY LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP
INTEREST SURVEY

PART 1: The topic areas listed below relate to leadership skills in the management of a local HCEEP project. The workshop will not be able to address all of these topics due to time constraints. We want to identify the topical areas that are of most interest to the workshop participants. Please review the list below and priority rank the four you would most like to see addressed in the upcoming workshop.

___ Managing the Development of an Educational Model: defining the essential components of an educational model; the sequential stages in the development of a model; the role of evaluation in model development.

___ Personnel Management: general staff management as it relates to efficient program operations; providing for staff development/career development opportunities.

___ Fiscal Management: preparation of budgets; conducting cost analysis; accountability reporting.

___ Record Keeping: establishing and maintaining a filing system for program records; organizing child and family records; assuring confidentiality; providing for data retrieval.

___ Program Planning and Review Procedures: effective use of staff in program planning; systems for reviewing and refining the program; writing progress reports and continuation proposals; reporting to diverse audiences.

___ Communication and Problem Solving Skills: techniques for accurate perception and understanding of information; effective problem solving/conflict resolution strategies.

___ Liaison with Other Programs and Agencies: making initial contacts with other agencies; developing an ongoing relationship; exchanging services and resources; cooperative planning with other agencies.

___ Other Interest Areas:

PART 2: The workshop can also provide you with information in areas that relate to BEH, HCEEP Network activities, and the field of early childhood/special education in general. The following is a list of information areas that may be of interest to you. Please review the list and indicate your level of interest using the scale below. Again, not all areas can be covered at the workshop, so we want to determine those that are most important to you.

High Interest		Some Interest		No Interest
5	4	3	2	1

___ Knowledge of professional organizations that provide national leadership in early education of the handicapped (e.g., CEC, NAEYC).

___ Knowledge of periodic publications that deal with early education of the handicapped.

___ Knowledge of national organizations that focus specifically on the education of ethnic/cultural groups.

____ Knowledge of national meetings and conferences (who attends, what typically is presented, how to get on the agenda).
____ Knowledge of HCEEP Network happenings (special interest group meetings, Directors' Conference, newsletters of TA agencies).
____ Knowledge of federal legislation that affects the early education of the handicapped.
____ Knowledge of funding sources for early education of the handicapped.
____ Knowledge of BEH programs that relate to early education (e.g., incentive grants, State Implementation Grants, training programs, research, etc.).
____ Knowledge of BEH organizational structure (i.e., major divisions and their respective programs).
____ Other Information Areas:

Please list the person(s) from your project who will be attending the workshop.

Person(s) and Title(s):
Address:
Phone:

APPENDIX C

MINORITY LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP
SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT-IDENTIFIED ISSUES

This appendix contains a composite list of specific issues of concern identified at the Minority Leadership Workshop held in Arlington, Virginia, May 21-23, 1979. In order to expedite the task of making recommendations, these issues have been organized under general categories. We will address these issues by making recommendations to: (a) minority project leaders, (b) BEH, and (c) TA agencies. (See Appendix D.)

It may be helpful to look at these issues in terms of: (a) services to minority children/families, and (b) minority leaders.

		No. of Times Mentioned in Small Group Sessions
TRAINING		
1.	How do we obtain funds for necessary training? a. paraprofessionals = credentials b. trained professionals = incentives	3
2.	Finding the "right" staff in rural areas.	1
3.	Training professionals in cultural sensitivity.	2
4.	Training paraprofessionals in educational skills.	2
5.	Training parents.	2
6.	How do we train ourselves as a source for staff development (i.e., conflict between staff roles and responsibilities).	2
7.	How do we identify the appropriate training persons or agencies?	1
8.	Finding the "right" staff in urban areas.	1
	TOTAL	15
COOPERATION AND FEEDBACK BETWEEN BEH AND INDIVIDUAL MINORITY PROJECTS		
1.	Projects need to inform BEH (and others) in a systematic manner of the problems encountered by minority projects.	6
2.	Better support and clarification of expectations from BEH.	3
3.	Due to the unique problems encountered by minority projects, we often find ourselves trying to catch up. We need more time than our usual three-year funding period.	3
4.	We need more funds because of special (unique) needs of our projects.	2

5.	We need to develop a network among minority projects at the national, state and local levels. BEH can help us with this.	2
6.	The realities of problems for minority projects have not been perceived by BEH.	2
7.	More minorities should be represented on BEH staff.	2
8.	BEH can help us identify resources: (a) directories of people, funding agencies, etc.; (b) people with cultural sensitivity; and (c) people with educational skills relevant to minority project needs.	2
9.	We need a forum for sharing adaptations of our programs with other projects.	1
10.	We need to identify the developmental stages within a three-year minority project and determine if that is or is not different from non-minority projects.	1
11.	We need to be informed about SIGs.	1
12.	We need to examine other fiscal management systems used by other BEH projects.	1
	TOTAL	26

LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1.	Leaders neet to: (1) identify priorities, (2) share ideas among other minority projects, (3) document our uniqueness, (4) identify outstanding minorities in our area, (5) develop a network among minorities and other agencies, (6) know national, state and local legislation, (7) locate other funding sources, and (8) tap TA resources.	8
2.	We need to be more systematic in staff development.	2
3.	We need to be more careful in identifying appropriate personnel with professional skills and cultural sensitivity.	1
4.	We have to be more assertive in hiring minority staff.	1
5.	We need to train ourselves as change agents.	1
	TOTAL	13

INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

1.	We need to educate (sensitize) other projects about minority projects.	4
2.	Be aware of conflict among agencies providing services to the same population (e.g., private vs. public).	12

3.	Break down system constraints within public school/universities.	1
4.	Our projects and other agencies need to confront possible differences in philosophies.	1
5.	Identify issues and/or barriers in relationship to establishing communication and cooperation with other agencies.	1
6.	How do we identify the lines of power in other agencies?	1
7.	Examine our insecurity in relationship to other agencies.	1
8.	Learn the politics of other agencies.	1
9.	Because of philosophical and personality conflicts between agencies and agency personnel.	1
	TOTAL	12

SENSITIVITY ACROSS CULTURES

1.	We have to understand and operate within two cultures. This is a double-edge sword: one has to function under two conceptual frameworks in order to do the job.	4
2.	How can we meet the criteria of middle class projects? BEH operates under middle class values which do not give credit to the uniqueness of minority projects.	3
3.	We need to develop our own data to show why different cultural strategies are necessary. In other words, we need to build our case via concrete evidence.	2
4.	Recruitment and assessment procedures are complicated by the unique problems inherent in minority populations (fear, language, difficult attitudes, mobility, etc.).	2
5.	How can we implement and learn from proposals written by others and for other populations?	1
6.	Other agencies may be biased toward minority projects. How do we overcome this?	1
	TOTAL	14

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

1.	Motivating multicultural parents (urban, rural).	3
2.	How do we make sure that our staff is sensitive to the peculiar cultural dynamics of the population being served?	2
3.	How can we educate parents regarding their legal rights?	2

4.	Identify/specify the effect geographic area/size has on parent involvement.	1
	TOTAL	8

CONSULTANTS

1.	How can we find multicultural consultants?	1
2.	How can we train multicultual consultants?	1
3.	How can we use the consultant more constructively?	1
	TOTAL	3

POPULATION

1.	We need to define and develop criteria for multicultural populations.	2
2.	Identification of minority populations takes some time.	1
3.	We have to reorganize our plans to meet the needs of the population being served; this takes time.	1
4.	Selection of children: sometimes you end up with a different population than expected or outlined in proposal.	1
5.	We have difficulties in adhering to the populations to be served as stated in the proposal.	1
	TOTAL	6

CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION

1.	We have to deal with language barriers that affect our interaction with parents, evaluation, assessment, public, diagnosis, educational planning, staff.	7
2.	Any adaptations of curriculum must be documented and shared with others.	1
3.	We need to develop curriculum sensitive to the particular population considered.	1
4.	We need to sensitize non-dominant staff about the necessity of correct curricula.	1
	TOTAL	10

EVALUATION

1.	We have problems in getting an adequate evaluation system established. Early TA assistance would be beneficial.	2
2.	We need standardized assessment tools for multicultural populations.	1
3.	We have problems getting evaluation data from clients.	1

4.	How cost effective are our programs?	1
	TOTAL	5

FUNDING PROBLEMS

1.	We need firm documentation data on our projects.	3
2.	Documentation of everyday things can be useful as a later resource.	1
	TOTAL	7

DAILY BREAKDOWN OF CATEGORIES

Category	Mon.	Tues.
Training	14	1
Cooperation/Feedback BEH/Project	14	12
Leadership Activities/Responsibilities	10	3
Interagency Coordination	6	6
Sensitivity Across Cultures	10	4
Parent Involvement	7	1
Consultants	2	1
Population	4	2
Curriculum/Instruction	9	1
Evaluation	3	2
Funding Problems	0	7
	79	49

APPENDIX D

RECOMMENDATIONS GENERATED BY PARTICIPANTS

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO ALL CONCERNED

Group 1
- -To develop some specific incentive to attract minorities to train in specialized areas (e.g., OT/PT, psychologist, speech pathologist, etc.) and to work in remote areas.

Group 2
- -BEH/TA: provide HCEEP minority project administrators with more information about ways of maximizing project budgets which will allow them to compete in the recruitment and retention of staff.

Group 3
- -Develop public awareness of specialized areas of needs.
  1. Appeal to career education in junior and senior high schools.
  2. Appeal to students in colleges and universities.
- -Information from this conference should be disseminated to other minorities to stimulate proposal preparation and project operation.

Group 4
- -Sensitivity training to include emphasis on: (a) cultural differences, (b) minority needs, (c) needs of minority projects and populations, (d) giving credit to uniqueness of minority projects.
- -Develop trust by using the minority leadership which provides for the opening up of the coordination process.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO MINORITY PROGRAMS/LEADERS IN HCEEP

Group 1
- -Seek out UAFs, RAPs, RRCs, SIGs and universities for training staff and to make available opportunities for students to do internships in our projects.
- -Work with state agencies and SIGs to develop standards and certification to fit local needs.

Group 2
- -Projects: assume the responsibility for providing the TAA with materials for inclusion in the "Minority Perspective" columns of the newsletter.
- -Projects: make serious effort to communicate their needs to BEH and TA providers.

Group 3
- -Open doors of HCEEP projects to students in colleges (when applicable); encourage them as to the need for minority participation in specialized education.
- -Make an assertive effort to send job vacancies to minority colleges and universities.
- -Since colleges and universities cannot produce enough qualified personnel to fulfill our needs, project directors need to institute more in-depth staff development processes.
- -We as directors should disseminate to other projects curriculum materials found to be effective in programming for minority children.

-Make a special effort to develop materials where needed through BEH and TA assistance.

Group 4
-The leadership consortium should provide input to BEH for minority programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Group 1
-Initiate planning for the development of a Cultural Management Leadership Development Institute on an ongoing basis.
-Provide technical assistance in (a) reviewing existing agency requirements to hire staff, (b) developing job descriptions, and (c) identifying resources to obtain minority staff.
-Make available the following resources to minority-allied professionals: (1) HCEEP project information and (2) inservice training for the purpose of increasing services to young minority handicapped children and their families.

Group 2
-TAA: develop preguidelines and an interactive communicative process prior to and for facilitating effective needs assessments.
-TA: make sure that TA newsletters include an ongoing "Minority Perspectives" column.
-BEH/TA: expand minority field personnel involvement in BEH activities (e.g., policy making, conference and program planning, announcement of position availability at BEH, service delivery [NA, TA speech]). This involvement should be ongoing, not a one-time effort.

Group 3
-The agencies should prepare and send to projects a list of minority professional organizations and affiliations.
-If recommendations made by task force cannot be fulfilled by BEH, TADS and WESTAR should be committed to implementing recommendations.

Group 4
-Identified minorities should be retained for TA network.
-Increase funding for inservice training on the local level for minority projects.
-Utilize model programs as trainers for personnel of other minority projects as needed as resources and educators.
-BEH and TA need to make projects aware of where and how to get funding for training of volunteers.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO BEH

Group 1
-Fund projects for training and certifying minority paraprofessionals.
-Compile a list of available resources in each state which identify individuals with specialized training and multicultural backgrounds.
-Develop directories and catalogues describing early childhood/special education activities (e.g., workshops, curriculum materials, staff training resources in universities and colleges) which are culture-specific.

-To sensitize itself to the need for developing minority parent training programs.
-Make available the following resources to minority-allied professionals: (1) HCEEP project information, and (2) inservice training for the purpose of increasing services to young minority handicapped children and their families.

Group 2
-Clarification of the information flow needs between HCEEP projects and BEH.
-Develop a HCEEP project expectation timeline for achievement of project activities during the funding cycle.
-Expand minority field personnel involvement in BEH activities (e.g., policy making, conference and program planning, announcement of position availability at BEH, service delivery [NA, TA speech]). This involvement should be ongoing, not a one-time effort.
-BEH/TAA: obtain awareness and training about factors and skills necessary to bridge professional ostracism, cultural mores (e.g., minority acceptance of handicapping conditions), distrust of services, and other unique characteristics affecting the development of HCEEP minority projects.
-Extend the 3-year funding cycle of HCEEP minority projects to consider the complex social structure which inhibits effective service delivery and in meeting federal requirements for model development (e.g., acceptance of handicapping conditions, the fact that something can be done and that help is available, as well as the conversion of existing materials into culturally appropriate materials).

Group 3
-Appeal to DPP to train minorities in specialized fields, such as school psychologists and social workers.
-Minority projects should be provided a status report of recommendations that will come out of this conference at the December Project Directors' Meeting in D.C.

Group 4
-Facilitate an increase of minority projects or leadership within the network by either changing the criteria or providing criteria that would allow projects to replicate or become resource models.
-Utilize model programs as trainers for personnel of other minority projects as needed as resources and educators.
-Increase funding for inservice training on the local level for minority projects.
-BEH and TA agencies need to make projects aware of where and how to get funding for training of volunteers.
-Develop and expand the concept of a third-party agent that is involved and includes all minorities (such as Moton has been). Agent should remain separate from BEH and TA agencies.
-The leadership consortium should provide input to BEH for minority programs.
-Identified minorities should be retained for TA network.
-BEH staff should have representation from different ethnic minority groups, that is, Native American, Asian American, and Spanish-speaking.

APPENDIX E

MINORITY LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP
POSITION PAPER

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH), through the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP), has demonstrated a concern for the establishment of effective programs to meet the needs of handicapped minority children from birth through eight. The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has supported these efforts by providing funds to 27 HCEEP minority-administered projects funded through the 1979 fiscal year. Public Law 94-142, along with the amended Public Law 89-313, attempt to ensure that the needs of these children are met through funds provided by federal legislation. Census figures indicate higher birth rates in minority groups; consequently, a continued increase in programs to serve the handicapped members of this population can be expected. We commend BEH for their efforts in providing funds to the 27 projects. However, figures cited at the leadership workshop indicate that 48 percent of the total HCEEP target population are of minority groups, demonstrating that this effort falls short. The percentage of minority membership in the total target population in itself provides some credence to the assertion by participants at the conference that within this target population exist problems unique to minorities (American Indians, Hispanos, Blacks, Asian Americans). Participants recognize that colleges and universities lack formalized programs for the preparation and development of paraprofessionals, teachers, other professionals and minority administrators in the area of early childhood education for the handicapped. Subsequently, individuals possessing adequate skills, sensitivity to culturally diverse populations and minimum qualifications remain inaccessible to new, as well as established, programs designed to meet the needs of handicapped children and their families.

Furthermore, there exists a need for accurate procedures which identify and locate handicapped minority children for the purpose of providing appropriate services to children and their families; a need for assessment instruments that accurately reflect the efforts of cultural diversity upon the growth and development of children; and a need for practical management procedures for minority leaders which would include fiscal management, personnel management, operational manuals, development of operational materials, and so on.

We feel that BEH's concern in the area of minority involvement has been expressed through the use of Moton Institute to provide technical expertise to minority administrators for the purpose of assisting them in developing project proposals to HCEEP. The fact that we are gathered in a HCEEP-sponsored Minority Leadership Workshop also reflects BEH's concern and continued efforts to expand the scope of minority involvement.

This narrative then is an attempt to synthesize concerns and express the need to BEH for minority involvement to assist in future program planning at the federal level, to impress upon BEH and state agencies the importance of involving minority group members in the development of state plans, and to propose a vehicle through which BEH-HCEEP concerns in regard to minorities can be more effectively addressed. This vehicle, we believe, should be a viable active consortium assembled from the participants at this workshop. The consortium could address problems such as continuous funding through state, county and local sources at the completion of the federal funding cycle, and the provision of assistance in the generation of proposals by other minority administrators to meet the needs of unserved children.

Participants at the HCEEP Minority Leadership Workshop feel that the BEH commitment, in conjunction with federal legislation, indicate a strong awareness of minority concerns as they relate to the education of preschool handicapped. We feel that statistics support the need to address problems of educational programming which result from being handicapped and a minority member. By utilizing the leadership identified at this workshop, concrete action can be taken to increase and improve services to this population. BEH, based upon their legislative mandate, should and are urged to assume the leadership position in providing equal educational opportunities for the handicapped child.

GOAL

To formalize a consortium of minority leaders from BEH-funded HCEEP projects by October 1, 1979.

OBJECTIVES

A. To formulate a nonprofit corporation of BEH-funded minority projects by July 31, 1979.
B. To formulate specific objectives, methods of operation, timetables, and budgets of the consortium by August 30, 1979.
C. To determine the staffing needs of the consortium and employ competent staff by September 30, 1979.
D. To develop and implement a communication network within the consortium and other identified minority leaders by October 31, 1979.

METHOD OF OPERATION

The Board of Directors will employ a consortium consultant for the period of approximately three (3) months to coordinate the efforts of the consortium. The consultant will specify implementation action steps that will be developed and achieved during this time frame.

BUDGET

Personnel		
Staff Consultant	60 days @ $125 per day	$ 7,500
Travel		
Local/travel (staff consultant)		2,000
Five participants @ $450		2,250
Supplies		
Postage, telephone, consumable materials		500
	TOTAL	$12,250

APPENDIX F

MINORITY LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP
EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to gather your opinions concerning the quality and usefulness of this workshop. We will use the information you provide to determine the effectiveness of this meeting and to improve future meetings of this kind. We appreciate your most honest and objective opinions. THANK YOU.

Please indicate your professional affiliation:

HCEEP Demo. Proj. ___ TADS ___ Moton ___

HCEEP SIG ___ WESTAR ___ BEH ___ Other ___ Resource Person ___

I. To what extent did you perceive the workshop to have achieved its purposes? (Please circle the appropriate response for each item.)

Workshop Purposes	Very Well	Adequately			Not at all
1. To promote the development of leadership skills in directing an HCEEP project, in contributing to the HCEEP Network, and the field of early childhood/special education in general.	5	4	3	2	1
2. To provide an opportunity for workshop participants to share project resources among themselves.	5	4	3	2	1
3. To identify issues that are of common concern to HCEEP minority staff and to develop recommendations for addressing those issues.	5	4	3	2	1
4. To facilitate the participation of minority professionals in the future development of early education programs for the handicapped, especially within HCEEP.	5	4	3	2	1

II. Indicate each of the workshop sessions which you attended by placing an X on the line beside the session description. Then rate the quality and usefulness of each session you attended. Please circle your ratings:

QUALITY 5=Excellent, 3=Average, 1=Poor

USEFULNESS 5=Very Useful, 3=Of Some Use, 1=Not Useful

	QUALITY	USEFULNESS
Monday, May 21, 1979		
__ Insights into the Leadership Role	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
__ Managing the Development of an Educational Model	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
__ Small Group Discussion Session	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
__ Feedback Panel from Small Groups	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
__ Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills - I	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
__ Program Planning and Review Procedures/Record Keeping - I	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
__ Fiscal Management	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
__ Sharing of Resources among Projects	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
Tuesday, May 22, 1979		
__ Panel on Legislation & Funding Sources	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
__ Personnel Management/Communication and Problem Solving Skills - II	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
__ Program Planning and Review Procedures/Record Keeping - II	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
__ Liaison with other Agencies	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
__ BEH and Early Childhood Education	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
__ Early Education of the Handicapped: The Ecology of the Professional Field	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
__ Discussion of Issues of Common Concern	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
Wednesday, May 23, 1979		
__ Morning Discussions & Recommendations	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1

We are very interested in your feedback. Please list any comments you wish to make on individual sessions. (Use back of form, if needed.)

Session Title: Comments:

Session Title: Comments:

Session Title: Comments:

III. Please respond to each of the following questions. Your answers will be carefully reviewed and considered.

1. What was the most positive part of the workshop for you? Please explain.

2. If there were to be another workshop for HCEEP minority staff, what topics do you believe it should cover?

3. If there were to be another workshop, what changes in format and scheduling would you recommend?

4. We plan to develop a proceedings document for this meeting. In your opinion, what elements are essential to be included in it?

5. Do you feel this workshop was worth the time and effort you invested? Yes ___ No ___

   Comments:

6. Please indicate your overall satisfaction with this workshop. (Please circle appropriate response.)

Extremely Satisfied		Satisfied		Not at All Satisfied
5	4	3	2	1

7. List any other comments you would like to make concerning the workshop.

Please return this questionnaire before you leave the workshop, or mail it to: Tal Black
TADS
500 NCNB Plaza
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

TADS, UNC-Chapel Hill, 1979